

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. By the present amendment, claims 11-14 remain in the application while claim 11 has been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0019249 to Kashu et al. (hereinafter “Kashu”). As described above, claim 11 has been amended and for the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 11, Kashu does not teach “the display portion driving control unit changes at least one of the drive system of the display portion and the driving frequency of the display portion based on whether the apparatus itself is in a voice communication mode or a voice playback mode,” as required. The Examiner relies on the teaching of Kashu turning the LCD 18 and/or the LCD backlight 19 ON/OFF based on the detection of a voice signal. However, turning ON/OFF the display or backlight does not result in changing the drive system or driving frequency of the display. Therefore, as the prior art reference fails to teach all the limitations in claim 11, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,211,854 to Fujiyoshi. As explained above, claim 11 has been amended and for the following reasons the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above with regard to claim 11, from which claims 12 and 14 depend, Kashu does not teach “the display portion driving control unit changes at least one of the drive system of the display portion and the driving frequency of the display portion based on whether the apparatus itself is in a voice communication mode or a voice playback mode,” as required. Further, Fujiyoshi does not teach this limitation. Accordingly, even if Kashu and Fujiyoshi were combined, every limitation would not be taught. Therefore, as the prior art references fail to render all the limitations in claim 11 obvious, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claims 12 and 14 be withdrawn.

Further regarding claim 12, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Kashu does not disclose that “wherein the display portion driving control unit changes the drive system so as to drive the display portion by sequential scanning when movie display is performed”. Therefore, Fujiyoshi is relied upon for teaching this limitation, stating that “The suggestion/motivation would have been to provide reduced power consumption.” Applicants respectfully disagree. Fujiyoshi does not teach that using sequential scanning during movie display would achieve power savings. In fact, it teaches just the opposite. Fujiyoshi says that using *interlaced* scanning (called “reduction driving method” therein) reduces power use (see col. 1, lines 22-25). Fujiyoshi goes on to explain that the reason that the progressive (non-reduction) driving method must be used for

displaying moving images is that the reduction (interlaced) method would cause defective elements such as lags and tailings to appear (see col. 1, lines 25-30). Accordingly, there is no suggestion/motivation in Fujiyoshi that modifying the teachings of Kashu to use sequential scanning when movie display is performed would result in power savings; clearly it would not. Therefore, as the prior art references fail to render all the limitations in claim 12 obvious, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kashu in view of Fujiyoshi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,809,774 to Yamazaki (hereinafter "Yamazaki"). As described above, claim 11 has been amended, and for the following reasons the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above with regard to claim 11, from which claim 13 depends, Kashu does not teach "the display portion driving control unit changes at least one of the drive system of the display portion and the driving frequency of the display portion based on whether the apparatus itself is in a voice communication mode or a voice playback mode," as required. Further, neither Fujiyoshi nor Yamazaki discloses this limitation. Accordingly, even if Kashu, Fujiyoshi and Yamazaki were combined, every limitation would not be taught. Therefore, as the prior art references fail to render all the limitations in claim 11 obvious, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of dependent claim 13 be withdrawn.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: 40221.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Aaron A. Fishman/  
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. 44,682

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: June 1, 2011